

A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF BIDEN'S SPEECH ON WAR IN UKRAINE AS A HERALD OF PENDING MAJOR GLOBAL GEOPOLITICAL SHIFTS

COCOU ANDRE DATONDI

Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Benin

ABSTRACT

This study applies Fairclough's perspective on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a scientific tool to investigate how language is used to routinize ideology and power status both overtly and covertly. The research associates the dual scheme of the semantic and pragmatic potentials of language as displayed in President Joseph Biden's speech on Ukraine's invasion by Russia. It uses the linguistic and socially entwined feature of CDA for a quantitative and qualitative analysis that culminated in the pairing and comparing of what is discoursed with the state of affairs between Russia on the one hand and Ukraine, the United States of America, the European Union and the Partner countries on the other. The findings reveal through the layout of President Biden's speech, the lexical occurrences and the discourse strategies that Russia represents a real concern and a threat for the United States of America and its allies and partners altogether within a geopolitical context of a weakening American deterrence capacity. The study concludes on the probability of a major global geopolitical shift in terms of technological, economic and military power ahead of the ongoing war.

KEYWORDS: Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Strategies, Politeness, Lexical Occurrences, Ideology & Power

Received: Apr 06, 2022; **Accepted:** Apr 26, 2022; **Published:** May 09, 2022; **Paper Id:** IJELJUN202212

INTRODUCTION

Power is a social construct and is essentially molded, expressed and enforced through language as a social reality because language lies at the heart of what it means to be human (Crystal, 2000). Indeed, language plays an important role in the way both individuals and institutions construe their own social beliefs, worldviews, and the set of ideas which determine subsequent thinking processes, their behavioral attitudes and the equivalent actions. Discourse thus functions ideologically in society to support and legitimate the exercise of power and naturalize [even unjust] social relations, making them seem the inevitable consequence of commonsense necessity (Lemke, 1995, 20). As Gee (1997) puts it, "Discourses" are characteristic ways of talking and writing about, as well as acting with and toward people and things such as certain perspectives and states of affairs come to be taken as "normal" or "natural" and others come to be taken as "deviant" or "marginal".

Considering this predominant influence of language in ideological representation and the construction of power, this research paper proposes to analyze the February 24th, 2022 address of the United States' Head of State (henceforth US-HOS), Joseph Biden on Ukrainian war, through a Critical Discourse Analysis. Actually, in this researcher's view, this war might be a herald of a pending global geopolitical shift. The motivation for the choice of this linguistic production for a Critical Discourse Analysis is twofold. Firstly, as a world superpower, the United States of America holds a front and strategic position ahead of European Union and other partner countries in containing and hopefully stopping Russia in Ukraine. Secondly, since the "loss of China" to communism after World War II and the failure of American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is a growing proliferation of the

idea of a declining American power and influence (<https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2013/12/03/public-sees-u-s-power-declining-as-support-for-global-engagement-slips>). Within such a context, it becomes tremendously important for the linguist to cast an observant check on what is expressed through language and evaluate how it pairs or contrasts with social realities and more specifically in the frame of this work, the ongoing war in Ukraine. Indeed, the ideology routinizing and power embodiment features of language have made it to be seen in various theoretical perspectives by scholars in the field of linguistic studies. For Ferdinand de Saussure (1916), language is viewed in terms of *Langue* and *Parole* as a carrier of signs [signifier and signified], while Chomsky (1964) approaches it through the lens of competence and performance, and Halliday (1985a) as a functional tool for the simultaneous representation of ideational, interpersonal and textual meta functions. Whereas these scholars' perspectives may seem to display various discrepancies, they do come together on the social reality label and mandate of language as a tool for the social man in the representation of the dynamics of social interactions in all regards.

In other words and among a bunch of utilities, language serves as a vessel for ideology; it mediates individuals' thoughts and stands as the motivation of their social practices based on a host of conditions, i.e. context. The capacity to linguistically make the headline news for example with one's selected ideology may then result in a powerful tool in winning voices for a given opinion and goal. This work is one of applied linguistics. In its scientific endeavor, it attempts to avail of the theoretical landmarks of Fairclough's perspective on CDA to engage in a scientific enquiry into the overt and opaque links between the content of discourse and sociopolitical issues of ideology, power and hegemony (Fairclough, 1995). With this social ground holding and winning pattern of language, Fairclough (1995) conceives of power as conceptualized through asymmetries between participants in discourse events, and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and consumed in particular sociocultural contexts. This is the major motivation why this work sets out to explore the imbrications between language and social institutional practices, with broader social and political structures as well as their actions (Fairclough, 1995). In this regard, the social and interpersonal grounding as well as the power relation features of CDA appeal to politeness patterns for an insightful and holistic study. Taking the step on this communicative pattern after various scholars (Goffman 1967; Lakoff 1973; Leech 1983; Fromkin & Rodman 1988; Edwards 1985; Metts 2009), Brown and Levinson (1987) indicate that:

All competent adult members of a society have and know each other have "Face" which is viewed as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting of two related aspects: (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction (freedom of action and freedom from imposition) and (b) positive face as the positive consistent self-image or personality claimed by interactants."

In order to explore how this linguistic pattern shows through the US-HOS' speech and by way of its general objective, this work seeks to shed light on the overt and covert meaning of Biden's address and the reality of military, economic and ideological influences and challenges in the specific context of the Ukrainian war. The achievement of this goal drives first through a linguistic analysis aimed at foregrounding the role of language in conveying Washington and its partners' ideological view and power stand against Russia in this war. Secondly, and along the descriptive, interpretive and explanatory roadmap of CDA, this paper has worked out an attempt of paring and comparing with the state of world affairs between the involved countries in order to draw implications. How then does language serve the US-HOS to convey his

ideological standpoint and power influence in the context of this war? What subsequent inferences can one draw as a probable outcome from a cross check between his speech and the state of affairs on the ground?

As a way of foregrounding the areas that are to be focused in answering these research questions, this work hypothesizes that the weakening deterrence capacity of the United States of America appears in the background of Biden's speech and might ring the bell for major geopolitical shifts in world affairs.

The body of the study is composed of the methodology of the study, the Critical Discourse Analysis of Biden's Address, a world state of affairs analysis, as well as the findings and the discussion.

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The corpus of this study is the speech that was delivered by the US-HOS on February 24th 2022, after Russia started war in Ukraine. This speech has been analysed based on a mixed method, associating both quantitative and qualitative input. As Creswell (2003) posits, the quantitative method is designed to assessing cause-consequence aspects of a study through experiments, surveys, comparison and variables measurements, as well as observations. In the case of this study, the quantitative method has been used to obtain and apply comparative analysis on lexical occurrences and statistical differences relating to the use of discourse strategies such as Repetitions (R), Russia Face Threatening Acts (RFTA), Coalition Face Saving Acts (CFSa) and Discourse break instances (Db) by the discourser while addressing Russia on the first hand, and America and its allies and partners on the other. The same statistical count has been adopted for lexical occurrences with Pro-American lexical designations and Pro-Russian lexical designations as presented in Table 1. In the frame of this work, the appellation "Pro-American lexical designations" is used for all words that are directly related to and linked with the United States of America. On the opposite, the term "Pro-Russian lexical designations" means the same on Russia's side. The gathering and analysis of these quantitative data throughout the address have been useful in building comparative approaches.

As far as the qualitative method is concerned, it has been helpful in the descriptive, interpretive and explanative task that is expected from the critical discourse analyst. On this specific point, the use of the qualitative method has made it possible to provide insights and embark on explanative inferences that resulted in the uncovering of some opaque aspects of the speech and some deductions about the probable geopolitical reshuffles and power challenge consequences of the ongoing war. The next session to this study tackles the critical discourse analysis under various sub-headings.

Critical Discourse Analysis of Biden's Address

This section of the work is composed of the outline of the US-HOS' speech and the linguistic analysis respectively.

Outline of Biden's Speech

A researcher's reading through President Biden's speech discloses an outline which unfolds through four parts. Firstly, and subsequently to his greetings to the waiting audience, the US-HOS sets the focus on the intentional and logistical preparation of Russia's brutal assault on Ukraine, a sovereign, peaceful and non-aggressive State. He carries on and informs on Russia's refusal of diplomatic talks in spite of the US Government and its Allies and Partners' good faith efforts. The second part of the address covers the war kickoff by Russia and the announcement of economic sanctions by US the Administration, with the support of Allies and partners. Still in this part, the US-HOS displays his assurance of the heavy strike loaded against Russia in addition to NATO's sufficient pedigree to face the challenge of Russian power. In the

third section, President Biden indicates the constraints for American families and businesses while insisting on minimizing them. He expresses the same compassion for and solidarity with the Ukrainian people and gives assurance of US support while praising the courage and strength of the nation. Fourthly, Biden insists on Putin's desire for empire at all cost and expresses the way the US, the Allies and partners view and portray Russia's sinister view of the future of the world. Consequently, he praises the values of freedom and democracy as an identity of the United States of America and its partners and totally rejects intimidation and violence as a Russian worldview. The linguistic analysis carried out in the next sub-section provides more understanding on the content and intention of the US-HOS' speech.

Linguistic Analysis

This linguistic analysis of President Biden's address attempts to uncover how some bits of language have been used to build up an ideological, power challenge minded and strategic reaction to Russia's invasion in Ukraine. It is the intention of this researcher to abide by the linguistic and socially grounded features of CDA by including both the semantics [literal meaning] and the pragmatics [hidden meaning] of the US-HOS address in this analysis. To achieve this scientific goal, this part of the study has been divided into two subparts: a study of lexical occurrences on the first hand and a study of discourse strategies on the other. Both statistical [quantitative] and judgmental [qualitative] approaches have been adopted in this part of the work.

A Study of Lexical Occurrences

Lexical occurrences or lexical frequency is examined in this work through a statistical count of how frequently some specific content lexical items occur in relation to the specific context of the political speech under study. The method which is applied to such data is a mixed method [quantitative and qualitative] one because such an option makes it possible to thoroughly unfold the meaning potential embedded in President Biden's address. Based on this perspective, the included content words are those which are intrinsically related to the parties that are directly or indirectly involved in the Ukrainian war.

Table 1: Comparative Lexical Occurrences

The Parties	Lexical Designations	Number	Totals	Rates
Pro-American lexical designations	America/American	8	51	47%
	NATO	16		
	Allies	14		
	Partners	6		
	Individually listed partner countries + G7	7		
Pro-Russian lexical designations	Russia/Russian	33	57	53%
	Russian assets	5		
	Putin	16		
	Kremlin	3		

A check through these statistics from the US-HOS' speech shows on the first hand that references to pro-American designations including America, NATO, the Allies and partner countries reaches a cumulative total of 51 occurrences with a proportion of 47%. On the second hand, references to Russia and various appellations related to the country (Putin, Kremlin, Russian assets) reach a total of 57, with a proportion of 53% which is higher than pro-American lexical designations. An analytical reading and search into these proportions of occurrences allows inferring that Russia represents a major challenge to the United States of America, the European Union and the partner countries altogether. This perspective tends to be confirmed by the urgent necessity for the United States, in spite of its first world power status, to take the lead of a triadic coalition including its Allies and partners. A study of the discourse strategies feeds in additional

cues to the ideological and power stands of the conflicting parties.

A Study of Discourse Strategies

Discourse strategies are the linguistic and paralinguistic ways, devices and manners employed by interactants as an attempt to address each other in a particular context of a conversation (Gumperz, 1982). Discourse strategies thus include various linguistic features, face attitudes, shared feelings and mood, behavioral attitudes, phatic utterances, intonational patterns and sign language inputs that increase the pool of information that is conveyed consciously or unconsciously (Enkvist, 2011).

On the linguistic aspect, President Biden's speech displays four major discourse strategies that are Repetitions (R), Coalition Face Saving Acts (CFSA) and Russia Face Threatening Acts (RFTA) as well as Discourse break instances (Db). The term "Coalition is used in this work to represent the group of countries composed of the United States of America, the European Union and the partner countries. The following table presents these different discourse strategies as they have been identified and numbered in the full transcript of the speech in appendix.

Table 2: Discourse Strategies

Types of Discourse strategies	Number
Repetitions (R)	14
Russia Face Threatening Acts (RFTA)	39
Coalition Face Saving Acts (CFSA)	23
Discourse break instances (Db)	6

This recapitulative table shows the use of 14 Repetitions (R), 23 Coalition Face Saving Acts (CFSA), 39 Russia Face Threatening Acts (RFTA) and 6 Discourse break instances (Db). As far as repetitions are concerned, President Biden repetitively used prepositional phrases [[without^{R1a} provocation, //without^{R1b} justification, //without^{R1c} necessity]]; [[For weeks^{R3a} — for weeks^{R3b}]], [[Within moments^{R5a} — // moments^{R5b}]], [[private^{R13a} — // with the private sector^{R13b}]], adverbs [[ever^{R7a} — ever^{R7b}]] to put more emphasis on aspects of his address that are particularly important for him in the context of this war. He also used verb phrases with material process clauses in [[He moved^{R2a} He moved^{R2b}]], [[We will limit^{R6a} // We will limit^{R6b}]], [[cut off^{R8a} Russia's // cut it off^{Db1-R8b}]] to set emphasis on doings such as Russia assault on Ukraine in R2a/R2b and the coalition's arrangements for Russia's containment. Apart from the repetition rhetorical strategy, the US-HOS also pervasively used politeness features such as Face Saving Acts (FSA) and Face Threatening Acts (FTA) in which the ideological construct and power challenge message is more noticeable than in repetitions. In that respect, the statistics of 39 instances of Russia Face Threatening Acts (RFTA) is a strong signal of the total disapproval of Russia's war against Ukraine. Along this line, the Russian Head of State has been personally targeted with his name being mentioned repetitively in *RFTA_3_9_12_13_15_18_20_21_22_23_27_29_30_34_38* in a Face Threatening manner. Contrariwise, the American President heaps praises on his country, the Allies and the partner countries. Examples such as [good-faith effort^{CFSA_1}], [transparent with the world^{CFSA_1}], [we're going to impair their ability to compete^{CFSA_9}], [degrade its industrial capacity^{CFSA_12}], [to defend our NATO Allies^{CFSA_13}], [full force of American power^{CFSA_14}], [NATO is more united and more determined than ever^{CFSA_15}], [the greatest military Alliance in the history of the world — NATO^{CFSA_17}], [freedom-loving nations^{CFSA_18}], [the rest of the world stronger^{CFSA_20}], [Liberty, democracy, human dignity^{CFSA_21}], [Freedom will prevail^{CFSA_22}] are much illustrative in voicing the US-HOS' mind and attitude towards Russia.

In addition to these discourse strategies, the US-HOS wanted to make his address well perceived by his audience. For this purpose, he used imagery with a figurative language aimed not only at having words heard, but images seen as a

way of vividly depicting happenings in the real world. Successive clusters of semantic constructions (italicized and double-underlined) such as “missile strikes *began to fall*”, “*followed by tanks*”, “We saw a *flagrant violation*”, “*Then came in the air raids*, followed by tanks and troops *rolling in*”, “We will keep up this *drumbeat*”, “It will *strike a blow* to their ability”, “And it will be a *major hit*” are illustrative at this regard. In addition to this analysis, the linguistic and socially intertwined feature of CDA requires an overview of the world state of affairs related to the topic under study.

A World State of Affairs Analysis of Biden’s Address

The state of world affairs analysis of Biden’s speech is an attempt to point out some aspects of sociopolitical and institutional events on the international stage that could have any influence [positive or negative] on the echo to the address under scrutiny. This part of the study is purposed to use what is discoursed to shed light on what has remained opaque. It is composed of two subparts: an overview of the geopolitical reshuffles between Russia, Ukraine and NATO on the one hand and an overview of the world state of affairs analysis from US and Allies’ perspective on the other.

An Overview of the Geopolitical Reshuffles between Russia, Ukraine and NATO

The relations with Ukraine who gained its independence from the Soviet Union in August 1991 are one of the most complex ones for many different reasons. On the geographical part, Ukraine is located in Eastern Europe on the crossroads of major transportation routes from Europe to Asia and from the Scandinavian states to the Mediterranean region, lying on the northern shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. The country borders Poland, Slovakia and Hungary in the west, Belarus in the north, Moldova and Romania in the south-west. With a population of 43 million people (including Crimea), its geographical location, its economic and industrial power, nuclear weapon assets and racial configuration, Ukraine has remained a place of both high interest and concern for Russia, the European Union and the United States of America. In short, the country represents the place to do with than without. The need to have this difficult relation fixed led to the Minsk roundtables in 2014 and 2015 to solve the clashes in the Donbas. However, surprisingly, Russia and Ukraine interpreted these agreements differently. As for Russia, a full implementation of the agreements would ban NATO membership for Ukraine. In the Ukrainian interpretation, however, free elections should first be organized in the breakaway areas as a condition to the implementation of the Minsk accords. In addition, Ukraine is to keep its full willingness of a membership with NATO.

An Overview of the World State of Affairs Analysis from US and Allies’ Perspective

President Joseph Biden’s address on Russia’s invasion in Ukraine occurs at a time when the United States of America’s position as world super power is weakening geopolitically and militarily worldwide (<https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/>). A review of major events related to American foreign policy allows such a say. First, since the “Loss of China” to communism in 1949 after World War 2, the very occurrence of the 9/11 terrorist attacks sounded the death bell of the world’s mindset on the power and hegemony of the United States’ Federation. Subsequently, the fizzle out from Iraq in December 2011 and from Afghanistan in August 2021 without achieving the two major goals – eliminate terrorism and install democracy – appears in the eyes of the world as a major failure and a loss of credibility. Secondly, on the ground of the US’ leadership role in fighting the nuclear arm race, a report by the National Defense Strategy Commission indicates that “Doubts about America’s ability to deter and, if necessary, defeat opponents and honor its global commitments have proliferated” because of “political dysfunction” and “budget caps. This is a herald of the falling trend of US’s global leadership role to deter and keep its global hegemonic

status unquestionable. As far the contribution of the Allies and partners in standing against Russia is concerned, one can notice the European common and proactive front with unprecedented actions such as weapon delivery and financial support. However, a scientific quest and prospective attitude make it necessary to wonder how long they can stand the challenge. German's economic dependency on Russian gas is an illustration at this regard. A discussion of the findings achieved so far has been instrumental in the process of an insightful critical analysis of President Biden's address.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section of the research is composed of a presentation of a gist of the major findings on the first hand, and the discussion on the other.

FINDINGS

The first result of this work is an identification of the aspects that the US-HOS chose to foreground through the outlining of his address. The four parts of the speech are thus structured in a way that puts Russia as the opening and closing points. The US-HOS firstly recalled the intentional and logistical preparation of Russia for its assault on Ukraine and its refusal of diplomatic talks. The war kickoff comes next in the speech with the expression of the triadic coalition of the US, the Allies and partners' full capacity to stand the challenge. Thirdly, the US-HOS indicates the minimized constraints for America, praises Ukrainian courage, and promises assistance. In the fourth and final part of the address, Biden insists on Putin's desire for empire through intimidation and violence and praises the better values of democracy and freedom.

The second result of the research carries on with the attention focus on Russia. Actually, a lexical occurrence investigation unveils the first rank reference to Russia with a proportion of 53 % whereas references to the US, Allies and partners come second with 47 %. This shows that Russia is considered as a major concern, a worry and a threat by the triadic coalition altogether.

The third result of this work is obtained through a methodical identification of discourse strategies of repetitions (14), Russia Face Threatening Acts (39), Coalition Face Saving Acts (23) and Discourse break instances (6). This result too informs of a steady gaze that is cast upon Russia as the common foe. This is shown through the outstanding number of 39 references made about Russia in the form of Face Threatening Acts. In addition to this constant cast on Russia, the presence of the 6 discourse break instances seems to reveal a certain lack of discourse performance and assurance on the part of the discourses.

Fourthly, an overview of the geopolitical reshuffles between Russia, Ukraine and NATO on the first hand and an overview of world state of affairs analysis from US and Allies' perspective show that Biden's address is delivered in a context of a complex condition of rise and fall in power from the part of the protagonists. Consequently, there are discoursed, strategic, military and economic means used to maintain and/or gain influence in global affairs.

DISCUSSION

The linguistic analyses undertaken so far and the overview of relations between Russia, Ukraine, and the coalition show that the US-HOS speech occurs in a social and diplomatic context of an actual deterrence performance from Russia on Ukraine and an intelligence watch out and containment sanctions from the USA, the Allies and partners. On Russia's part, and with retrospection to the invasion of Chechen Republic, the annexation of Crimea, the formation of Russian-backed separatists "republics" in Ukraine, the ongoing action in one of deterrence for more control over what the country

considers as its influence zone. Through his speech the US-HOS is taking a stand of protection in favour of Ukraine where it has some strategic interests regarding nuclear weapon control and in favor of the European Union on account of the common membership in NATO. The United States of Biden's Administration takes the challenge of showing US power through a revived NATO to defend the European allies for a common stand against Russia to side together for Ukraine. This is shown through the abundant references to Russia as the aggressor, the tyrant perpetrating brutal assault against a non-provocative sovereign country. Although one can identify a successful intelligence watcher's role from the US, there is a very weak actual and effective deterrence performance, at least, through the impression that is displayed. In actual fact, and this is one of the opaque parts of the discourse, America has lost an important part of its influence on the global scene since its "loss of China" to communism after the second World War, and its failures in Iraq and Afghanistan, to name but these counter-productive stains in the American prestige, influence and dignity. In fact, Biden's straight statement that "Our forces are not going to Europe to fight in Ukraine" betrays the self-awareness of this loss of power and influence and appears as an offer of a free ground to Russia in Ukraine. United States' troops invaded Iraq without receiving an agreement from NATO and without the help of any allies because, this researcher infers, there was no doubt of power superiority, hence the above made inference. In fact, as far as American weakening influence is concerned, the Commission on the National Defense Strategy that worked under Authorization Act of 2017 from United States' Congress had sounded the alarm rather bluntly in an independent, non-partisan review(<https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/providing-for-the-common-defense.pdf>) as follows:

Doubts about America's ability to deter and, if necessary, defeat opponents and honor its global commitments have proliferated. Previous congressionally mandated reports, such as the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel and the 2014 National Defense Panel, warned that this crisis was coming. The crisis has now arrived, with potentially dire effects not just for U.S. global influence, but also for the security and welfare of America itself.

This first output of the discussion comes as an answer to the first research question in showing a lexical occurrence and discourse strategies that abound more in words than in effective actions taking on the United States of America's side. In the eyes of the world, and in spite of the sanctions, Russia is challenging the full of military and economic power of the West, commonly represented as the international community. One other important opaque feature of this address is that such a state of affairs of the weakening stand of the United States is strategically meaningful to other nations, besides Russia.

Actually, the absence of a swift deterrence capacity of the United States against Russia in Ukraine rings a bell to other nations where America has up to date held the lead against the proliferation of nuclear weapon. By way of illustration, in case this war takes long, and if Russia happened to resist the sanctions in spite of the heavy blow it makes on its country, it may set the start for a major global geopolitical influence shift between the West [United States of America, European Union and partner countries] and the East [Russia, China and other countries]. An anti-democratic, anti-western country or a coalition of such countries may thus take the lead of world affairs technologically, economically and militarily, thus birthing an unprecedented geopolitical map reshuffle. This represents a reply to the second research question and a confirmation of the hypothesis.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has been prompted on an observant reading of the American Head of State's speech subsequently to Russia's invasion in Ukraine after the intense diplomatic activities between Russia and the West. The first aspect which sets the start on undertaking this research is the number of countries that get together with the United States of America to stand against Russia to stop war in Ukraine, without much visible success on the ground up to date. The linguistic and socially intertwined characteristic of Critical Discourse Analysis has thus been identified as a relevant scientific tool for unveiling the links between what is discoursed and the state of security, diplomatic, ideological, political and power affairs between Russia on the first side, and the United States of America, the European Union and partner countries on the other. The mixed method analysis has thus been adopted to examine the corpus of this study, the US-HOS speech. Through the quantitative analysis, the generated statistics have been used to measure and compare data for the confirmation of the linguistic focus that is set on Russia throughout the speech in terms of words occurrences and discourse strategies. The qualitative analysis has been useful in uncovering the strategically opaque aspects of the address. It has also served in undertaking an insightful description, interpretation and explanation of the power decline and weakening deterrence capacity of the United States of America as the first world power from World War II to date. By pairing and comparing what is discoursed and the state of affairs between the involved countries, this study infers that the diminished power influence of the United States and the steps that Russia is currently taking in Ukraine are a major precedent that is likely to birth global geopolitical reshuffles.

REFERENCES

1. Batstone, R. (1995). *Grammar in Discourse: Attitude and Deniability*. In G. Cook and B Seidlhofer, (eds.) *Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 197-213.
2. Best, G. (2002). *Churchill: A Study in Greatness*. London: Penguin.
3. Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Chomsky, N. (1964). *Current issues in Linguistic Theory*. The Hague: Mouton
5. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge/Mass: MIT Press
6. Edwards, J. (1985). *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
7. Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. (1988). *An introduction to language (fourth edition)*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
8. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. London and New York: Longman
9. Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
10. Foley, W. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Diamond, I. & Quinby, I. (1988). *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press
12. Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.
13. Gee, J.P. (1997). *The new literacies and the "Social Turn"*. <http://www.schools.ash.org.au/litweb/page300.html> Retrieved on March 4th, 2022.
14. Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward

Arnold.

15. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985a). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold
16. Magocsi, P. R. (2014). *This Blessed Land: Crimea and the Crimean Tatars*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
17. Reisigl, M., Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse-historical Approach (DHA)*. In Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). London, England: SAGE.
18. Metts, S. (2009). "Facework". *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships: Vol. 1-. Encyclopedia of Human Relationships*. SAGE Publications
19. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
20. Enkvist, N. E. (2011). "Discourse Strategies and Discourse Types". In Ventola, E. (Ed), *Functional and Systemic Linguistics: Approaches and Uses*, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 3-22.
21. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.
22. Saussure, F, de.(1916/1966). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Paperbacks
23. Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell
24. Wilson, A. (2014). *Ukraine Crisis. What it Means for the West*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
25. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CPRT-110SPRT39674/html/CPRT-110SPRT39674.htm> Chain Reaction: Avoiding A Nuclear Arms Race in The Middle East Report to The Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate One Hundred Tenth Congress Second Session February 2008. Accessed on March 21th 2022
26. <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/providing-for-the-common-defense.pdf> Providing for the Common Defense: The Assessment and Recommendations of the National Defense Strategy Commission. Accessed on April 17th 2022.
27. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2013/12/03/public-sees-u-s-power-declining-as-support-for-global-engagement-slips> Accessed on April 17th 2022.
28. Chinyere, Ndukwe, Ikechukwu Ogeze Ukeje, and Johnpaul Chukwujindu Onele. "Leadership Styles and the Politics of Institutional Management of State-Owned Universities in Nigeria: Empirical Evidence from Ebsu, South-Eastern Geo-Political Zone, Nigeria." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)* 4.6 (2015): 91-102.
29. Agbo, Benedict Obiora, and Okechukwu Chukwuma. "Perceptual Influence of Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria's (Frcn) Igbo Programmes on the Promotion of Igbo Language in South-East Nigeria." *IASSET: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IASSET: JHSS)* ISSN (P): Applied; ISSN (E): Applied Vol. 3, Issue 2, Jul - Dec 2017; 11-22
30. Zikhali, Whitehead. "Putting the Last First: Using the Chamberian Lenses to Explore Poverty at Sivomo Village, Nkayi District, Zimbabwe." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)* ISSN(P): 2319-393X; ISSN(E): 2319-3948 Vol. 7, Issue 4, Jun - Jul 2018; 55-66

APPENDIX

Full text of Biden's Speech on Ukraine

White House on February 24, 2022, after Russia launched an invasion of Ukraine.

Russia face threatening act = RFTA, Coalition face saving act = CFSA, Repetition = R, Discourse break instance = Db

Sorry to keep you waiting. Good afternoon. The Russian military has begun a [brutal assault^{RFTA-1}] on the people of Ukraine [[without^{R1a} provocation, //without^{R1b} justification, //without^{R1c} necessity]]. This is a [premeditated attack^{RFTA-2}].

Impact Factor (JCC): 8.0652

NAAS Rating: 3.12

[Vladimir Putin^{RFTA-3}] has been planning this for months, as I've been — as we've been saying all along. [[He moved^{R2a} more than 175,000 troops, military equipment into positions along the Ukrainian border.

He moved^{R2b} blood supplies into position]] and built a field hospital, which tells you all you need to know about his intentions all along.

He rejected every [good-faith effort^{CFSA-}] the United States and our Allies and partners made to address our mutual security concerns through dialogue to avoid needless conflict and avert human suffering.

[[For weeks^{R3a} — for weeks^{R3b}]], we have been warning that this would happen. And now it's unfolding largely as we predicted.

In the past week, we've seen shelling increase in the Donbas, the region in eastern Ukraine controlled by [Russian-backed separatists^{RFTA-4}].

Rus- — the Russian government has [perpetrated cyberattacks^{RFTA-5}] against Ukraine.

We saw a staged political theater in Moscow — [outlandish and baseless claims^{RFTA-6}]] [[that Ukraine^{R4a} was — Ukraine was about to invade and launch a war against Russia, that Ukraine^{R4b} was prepared to use chemical weapons, that Ukraine^{R4c} committed a genocide]] — without any evidence.

We saw a [flagrant violation^{RFTA-7}] of international law in attempting to [unilaterally create^{RFTA-8}] two new so-called republics on sovereign Ukrainian territory.

And at the very moment that the United Nations Security Council was meeting to stand up for Ukraine's sovereignty to stave off invasion, [Putin^{RFTA-9}] declared [his war^{RFTA-10}].

[[Within moments^{R5a} — // moments^{R5b}]] missile strikes began to fall on historic cities across Ukraine. Then came in the air raids, followed by tanks and troops rolling in.

We've been [transparent with the world^{CFSA-1}]. We've shared declassified evidence about Russia's plans and cyber attacks and [false pretexts^{RFTA-11}] so that there can be no confusion or cover-up about what [Putin^{RFTA-12}] was doing.

[Putin^{RFTA-13}] is the [aggressor^{RFTA-14}]. [Putin^{RFTA-15}] [chose this war^{RFTA-16}]. And now he and his country [will bear the consequences^{RFTA-17}]

Today, I'm authorizing additional [strong sanctions and new limitations^{CFSA-2}] on what can be exported to Russia.

This is going to [impose severe costs on the Russian economy^{CFSA-3}], both immediately and over time.

We have purposefully designed these [sanctions to maximize the long-term impact on Russia^{CFSA-4}] and [to minimize the impact on the United States and our Allies^{CFSA-5}].

And I want to be clear: [The United States is not doing this alone^{CFSA-6}]. For months, we've been building [a coalition of partners representing well more than half of the global economy^{CFSA-7}].

Twenty-seven members of the European Union, including France, Germany, Italy — as well as the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and many others — to amplify the joint impact of our response.

I just spoke with the G7 leaders this morning, and we are in full and total agreement. [[We will limit^{R6a} Russia's ability to do business in Dollars, Euros, Pounds, and Yen to be part of the global economy. // We will limit^{R6b}]] their ability

to do that. We are going [to stunt the ability to finance and grow^{CFSA-8}] Rus- — the Russian military.

We're going to impose major — and we're going [to impair their ability to compete^{CFSA-9}] in a high-tech 21st century economy.

We've already seen the impact of our actions on Russia's currency, [the Ruble, which early today hit its weakest level^{CFSA-10}][[ever^{R7a} — ever^{R7b}]] in history. And the Russian stock market plunged today. The Russian government's borrowing rate spiked by over 15 percent.

In today's actions, we have now sanctioned Russian banks that together hold around \$1 trillion in assets.

We've [[cut off^{R8a}Russia's [[largest bank^{R9a} — a bank^{R9b}]] that holds more than one third of Russia's banking assets *by itself* — *cut it off*^{Db1-R8b}]] from the US financial system.

And today, we're also blocking four more major banks. That means every asset they have in America will be frozen. This includes V.T.B., the second-largest bank in Russia, which has \$250 billion in assets.

As promised, we're also adding names to the list of Russian elites and their family members *that are sanctioning* — *that we're sanctioning*^{Db2} as well.

As I said on Tuesday, these are people who personally gain from the Kremlin's policies and they should share in the pain. [We will keep up this drumbeat of those designations against corrupt billionaires^{CFSA-11}] in the days ahead.

On Tuesday, we stopped the Russian government from raising money from US or European investors.

Now, we're going to apply the same restrictions to Russia's largest state-owned enterprises — companies with assets that exceed \$1.4 trillion.

Some of the most powerful **impacts of our actions will come over time** as we squeeze Russia's access to finance and technology for strategic sectors of its economy and [degrade its industrial capacity^{CFSA-12}] for years to come.

Between our actions and those of our Allies and partners, we estimate that we'll cut off more than half of Russia's high-tech imports.

It will strike a blow to their ability **to continue to modernize their military**. It'll degrade **their aerospace industry, including their space program**. **It will hurt their ability to build ships, reducing their ability to compete economically**. And it will be a major hit to [Putin^{RFTA-18}]'s long-term strategic ambitions.

And we're preparing to do more. In addition to the economic penalties we're imposing, we're also taking steps [to defend our NATO Allies^{CFSA-13}], particularly in the east.

Tomorrow, NATO will convene a summit — we'll be there — to bring together the leaders of 30 Allied nations and close partners to affirm our solidarity and to map out the next steps we will take to further strengthen all aspects of our NATO Alliance.

Although we provided over \$650 million in defensive assistance to Ukraine just this year — this last year, let me say it again: Our forces are not and will not be engaged in the conflict with Russia in Ukraine. Our forces are not going to Europe to fight in Ukraine but to defend our NATO Allies and reassure those Allies in the east.

As I made crystal clear, the United States will defend every inch of NATO territory with the **[full force of**

American power^{CFSA_14}]. And the good news is: [NATO is more united and more determined than ever^{CFSA_15}].

There is [[no doubt^{R10a} — no doubt^{R10b}]]that the United States and every NATO Ally will meet our Article 5 commitments, which says that an attack on one is an attack on all.

Over the past few weeks, I ordered thousands of additional forces to Germany and Poland as part of our commitment to NATO.

On Tuesday, in response to Russia's [aggressive action^{RFTA_19}], including its troop presence in Belarus and the Black Sea, I've authorized the deployment of ground and air forces already stationed in Europe to NATO's eastern flank Allies: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania.

Our Allies have also been stepping up, adding — the other Allies, the rest of NATO — adding their own forces and capabilities to [ensure our collective defense^{CFSA_16}].

And today, within hours of Russia's unleashing its assault, NATO came together **and authorized and activated — an activation of response plans**^{Db3}.

This will enable NATO's high-readiness forces to deploy and — when and where they're needed to protect our NATO Allies on the eastern boundaries of Europe.

And now I'm authorizing additional US forces and capabilities to deploy to Germany as part of NATO's response, including some of US-based forces that the Department of Defense placed on standby weeks ago.

I've also spoken with Defense Secretary Austin and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, about preparations for additional moves should they become necessary to protect our NATO Allies and support [the greatest military Alliance in the history of the world — NATO^{CFSA_17}].

As we respond, my administration is using [[the tools^{R11a} — every tool^{R11b}]] at our disposal to protect American families and businesses from rising prices at the gas pump.

You know, we're taking active steps to bring down the costs. And American oil and gas companies [[should not^{R12a} —// should not^{R13b}]] exploit this moment to hike their prices to raise profits.

You know, in our sanctions package, we specifically designed to allow energy payments to continue.

We are closely monitoring energy supplies for any disruption. We have been coordinating with major oil producing and consuming countries toward our common interest to secure global energy supplies.

We are actively working with countries around the world to elevate [evaluate] a collective release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserves of major energy-consuming countries. And the United States will release additional barrels of oil as conditions warrant.

I know this is hard and that Americans are already hurting. I will do everything in my power to limit the pain the American people are feeling at the gas pump. This is critical to me.

But this aggression cannot go unanswered. If it did, the consequences for America would be much worse. America stands up to bullies. We stand up for freedom. This is who we are.

Let me also repeat the warning I made last week: If Russia pursues cyberattacks against our companies, our

critical infrastructure, we are prepared to respond.

For months, we have been working closely with our [[private^{R13a} — // with the private sector^{R13b}]] to harden their cyber defenses, sharpen our ability to respond to Russian cyber attacks as well.

I spoke late last night to President Zelensky of Ukraine and I assured him that the United States, together with our Allies and partners in Europe, will support the Ukrainian people as they defend their country. We'll provide humanitarian relief to ease their suffering.

And in the early days of this conflict, Russian propaganda outlets will keep trying to hide the truth and claim success for its military operation against a made-up threat.

But history has shown time and again how swift gains in territory eventually give way to grinding occupations, acts of [[mass civil^{R14a} — // mass civil^{R14b}]] disobedience, and strategic dead-ends.

The next few weeks and months will be hard on the people of Ukraine. [Putin^{RFTA_20}] has unleashed a great pain on them. But the Ukrainian people have known 30 years of independence, and they have repeatedly shown that they will not tolerate anyone who tries to take their country backwards.

This is a dangerous moment for all of Europe, for the freedom around the world. [Putin^{RFTA_21}] *has a — has committed^{Db4}* an assault on the very principles that uphold global peace.

But now the entire world sees clearly what [Putin^{RFTA_22}] *and his Kremlin — and his Kremlin allies^{Db5}* are really all about. This was never about genuine security concerns on their part. It was always about naked aggression, about [Putin^{RFTA_23}]'s [desire for empire by any means necessary^{RFTA_24}] — by bullying Russia's neighbors through [coercion and corruption^{RFTA_25}], by changing borders by force, and, ultimately, by choosing [a war without a cause^{RFTA_26}].

[Putin^{RFTA_27}]'s actions betray his [sinister vision for the future of our world^{RFTA_28}] — one where nations take what they want by force.

But it is a vision that the United States and [freedom-loving nations^{CFSA_18}] everywhere will oppose with every tool of our considerable power.

The United States and our Allies and partners will [emerge from this stronger, more united, more determined, and more purposeful^{CFSA_19}].

And [Putin^{RFTA_29}]'s aggression against Ukraine will end up costing Russia dearly — economically and strategically. We will make sure of that. [Putin^{RFTA_30}] will be a [pariah on the international stage^{RFTA_31}]. Any nation that countenances Russia's [naked aggression^{RFTA_32}] against Ukraine [will be stained by association^{RFTA_33}].

When the history of this era is written, [Putin^{RFTA_34}]'s choice to make a totally unjustifiable war on Ukraine will have left Russia [weaker^{RFTA_35}] and [the rest of the world stronger^{CFSA_20}].

[Liberty, democracy, human dignity^{CFSA_21}] — these are the forces far more powerful than [fear and oppression^{RFTA_36}]. They cannot be extinguished by [tyrants^{RFTA_37}] like [Putin^{RFTA_38}] and his armies. They cannot be erased *by people — from people's^{Db6}* hearts and hopes by any amount of [violence and intimidation^{RFTA_39}]. They endure.

And in the contest between democracy and autocracy, between sovereignty and subjugation, make no mistake: [Freedom will prevail^{CFSA_22}]. God bless the people of a free and democratic Ukraine. And may God protect our troops.